REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims have been neither amended nor canceled. Claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondoh et al.(US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0056377 A1) and further in view of Moor et al. (US Patent No. 6,330,575) and further in view of Brohoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,533). This rejection is traversed for the reasons stated below.

The Office Action acknowledges that neither Kondo et al. nor Moor et al. discloses a shopping mall organized according to geographic information of the plurality of agencies or stores. However Brohoff discloses a geographic database used in a number of different ways and for example in fig. 4, there are illustrated examples of different applications within a shopping mall. The inquiring party is interested in obtaining information from the geographic database concerning the service area. And specific information will be given as to identifying anyone of the establishments and how to reach that particular establishment, i.e. the location within the shopping mall where the establishment is located.

By way of review, Brohoff discloses a geographic database concerning the service area. However it fails to teach or suggest how to combine geographic information and product order information as recited in claim 1. As such, the Examiner fails to provide sufficient evidence that the cited combination discloses the features of the claimed invention, as is required to maintain a prima facie obviousness rejection of claim 1. (see MPEP, at 2143). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kondoh et al., Moor et al. and Brohoff does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 1.

Regarding claim 3, the Office Action acknowledges that Kondoh et al. fails to disclose a payment server. However the Examiner sets forth that Moor et al. teaches the use of a payment server, i.e. a transaction server in a distributed environment (multiple stores utilizing the same transaction server).

By way of review, the Examiner's comments do not address "an agency connecting unit receiving agency product information from corresponding agency web browsers through the Internet, relating a plurality of offline agencies according to geographic information for display according to a geographic input received from a connected customer web browser," as recited in claim 3. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kondoh et al. and Moor et al.

does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 3.

Regarding claim 4, the Office Action sets forth that Kondoh et al. teaches a cyber agency connecting unit having at least one hyper link corresponding to at least one web page provided by the plurality of cyber agency web servers, and that connects one of the cyber agency web servers decided by selection information received from the customer web browser, to the customer web browsers.

By way of review, Kondoh et al. discloses the relevant shop information is retrieved with reference to the shop layout DB. Further, the relevant goods information is display the shop information and goods information is formed and transferred to a requesting source (paragraph [0030]). However Kondoh et al. fails to disclose "a cyber agency connecting unit having at least one hyper link corresponding to at least one web page provided by the plurality of cyber agency web servers, and that connects one of the cyber agency web servers decided by selection information received from the customer web browser, to the customer web browser" as recited in claim 4. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kondoh et al. and Moor et al. does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 4.

Regarding claim 8, the Office Action acknowledges that neither Kondoh et al. nor Moor et al. discloses a shopping mall organized according to geographic information of the plurality of agencies of stores but Brohoff discloses a geographic database used in a number of different ways of and for example in fig. 4, there is illustrated examples of different applications within shopping mall.

By way of review, Brohoff discloses the specific information provided by the geographic database with respect to each of these hits may include geographic information on how to get to each of the locations. However Brohoff fails to teach or suggest "providing, on request of a customer web browser, an organization of the agencies according to geographic information of the agencies and from which the customer selects in order to select the agency, and providing agency product information of the selected agency to the customer web browser through an Internet" as recited in claim 8. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kondoh et al., Moor et al. and Brohoff does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 8.

In addition claims 13 and 15 are also submitted to be allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 8, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

Claims 2, 7, and 12 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondoh et al. in view of Moor et al. as applied to claims 1, 3, and 8 above, and further in view of Brohoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,533).

The Office Action acknowledges that neither Kondoh et al. nor Moor et al. teaches that the plurality of cyber agencies is divided according to regions in which each offline agency is located. However Brohoff discloses a plurality of cyber agencies such that, when the customer selects one of the regions in a map displayed by the cyber agency connecting unity through the customer web browser, the hyper links of all the cyber agency web servers related to the region are displayed, and the customer is enabled to select the cyber agency web server corresponding to the offline agency the customer wants (fig. 3).

By way of review, Brohoff discloses "it is generally of interest to know the geographic location of the mobile station of the inquiring party but it may also be of interest to know the position of other specific mobile subscribers within the system in order to satisfy an inquiry of the geographic database. Such geographic position information can be obtained, in certain cases, from knowledge as to the existing location or registration facilities, i.e., cells or location areas, which is used together with the geographic database to obtain information. The geographic database contains geographic information about each location area within the system."(col. 5, lines 54-64). However, Brohoff fails to teach or suggest "the shopping mall server further displays a map on the customer web browser such that, when the customer selects one of the regions in the map, hyper links of all the cyber agency web servers related to the selected one region are displayed, and the customer selects one of the cyber agency web servers having the displayed hyper links corresponding to the desired offline agency." as recited in claim 2.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kondoh et al., Moor et al. and Brohoff does not disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 2.

In addition, claims 7 and 12 are also submitted to be allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 2, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10-5-05

By: _____
John C. Garvey
Registration No. 28,607

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501